



Charles Marvin  
<charles@efficientlyne  
tworked.com>

01/29/2006 09:52 AM

To: AirportEIR@longbeach.gov, district1@longbeach.gov,  
district2@longbeach.gov, district3@longbeach.gov,  
district4@longbeach.gov, district5@longbeach.gov,  
district6@longbeach.gov, district7@longbeach.gov,  
district8@longbeach.gov, district9@longbeach.gov,  
mayor@longbeach.gov

cc:

Subject: [Suspected Spam]Long Beach Airport EIR

I would like to thank you for the opportunity to provide a response to the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR). I am concerned about the HNTB's conclusions.

I am alarmed by the Draft EIR's conclusion that the proposed project of a 103,000 square foot Terminal Building "is the environmentally superior alternative." According to USGBC LEED criteria which is supposed to be a guiding principal for this project, the larger a building is, the more it materials it requires to build, the more energy it requires to light, the more energy it requires to air condition, the more energy it requires to heat, more chemicals it requires to maintain, and it creates more heat source in an urban landscape. Furthermore the larger alternative relies on the development presently undeveloped of Parcel "O" which is now open space and permeable land. **According to LEED principals, the larger building would be the environmentally INFERIOR alternative.**

HNTB's 2004 study recommending an even larger terminal building shows bias. City Council approved a smaller size option because HNTB conclusions ignored the voices of hundreds of hours of testimony of residents who oppose airport expansion. For purposes of this study, the City Council voted to study a stated project - nothing more. If the EIR discusses HNTB's recommendations at all, it **must also cite all the public testimony that HNTB ignored** because airport management was paying for the study.

The public has just recently learned that the noise calculation **disregarded the high level of noise when a jet is taking off and landing, when wheels are on the ground.** Full public disclosure requires that ALL the airport noise, noise that the surrounding community is exposed to, must be disclosed. This includes ALL the noise from life-flight, military and any other aviation noise that may be disregarded in the budgets for the Noise Ordinance. Policy makers and the public must have a comprehensive data of all the noise exposure. The noise contours must show all the present and expected noise impacts.

It is unacceptable that the Draft EIR **failed to include air quality data of actual air sampling** taken at, near and around the airport property. The evaluation of emissions form aircraft still using lead-based additives in aviation fuel must be conducted. **Lead exposure** is very hazardous. In public scoping meetings, there was an overwhelming public demand for actual air sampling, The only existing air collection point is many blocks upwind of the airport. When a jet runs up it engines at take off, jet exhaust levels are very high and are blown into residential neighborhoods. A single collection point upwind of the runway is unacceptable to evaluate this pollution. Residents demand to know the cumulative negative impact associated with the ports pollution and the 710 corridor for the movement of goods, must be considered so the public knows the **health risks and liability.**

**I am not fundamentally opposed to modernizing the airport. I am opposed to enlarging it.**

**I am concerned that the Draft EIR is flawed. It should be treated with skepticism.**

Thank you,

Charles L. Marvin  
Long Beach Business Owner and Resident  
ph: 562-756-1272  
5353 E. Daggett St.  
Long Beach, CA 90815